REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on July 31, 2008, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration. Claim(s) 1-3,5-38 and 40 are now pending in this Application. Claim(s) 1, 9, 28, 29, 37, 38 and 40 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claim(s) 1, 5, 9, 18, 21, 28, 29, 37, 38 and 40 have been amended and claim(s) 41 and 42 have been added. Applicants have amended the claims to further clarity the invention. Support for the amendments can be found on page 8 lines 27 to 29, page 10 lines 20-22 and generally throughout the Specification. Support for new claim 41 can be found in original claim 18 and support for new claim 42 can be found on page 18 line 22-28 and Fig. 3 and related description. No new matter has been added. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Pollack for the courtesy of an interview on November 24, 2008 and his helpful comments. The interview included a discussion with respect to claim 1 and the cited prior art. Agreement was reached at the meeting as to the allowability of an amended claim 1. It was also agreed that claim 18 included some patentable features.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araujo et al. (6,920,502) in view of Low et al. (7,000,019).

Applicants respectfully submit that in operation Araujo uses an HTTPS protocol which is not a stateless protocol:

> Once SEP 200 is fully functioning in its network environment, a user situated at his(her) PC can readily and remotely access his(her) office network-based applications by simply establishing a secure web (HTTPS) connection to a web server implemented on SEP 200. (Araujo, Col 14 lines 45-60)

Applicants respectfully submit that HTTPS is stateful protocol. A summary describing HTTPS as a stateful protocol can be found at http://saloon.javaranch.com/cgi-bin/ubb/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get_topic&f=26&t=005858 as follows:

> HTTPS runs over SSL/TLS. SSL/TLS not only encrypts the data stream but also includes the provision for a session id (it's probably used to keep track of the encryption properties). If the server doesn't want to engage in a session with the client then it returns an empty session id. If it wants to allow a session it can return a unique session ID for the client to use on the next request. Given that SSL/TLS already tracks the session (state) it is no longer necessary to put a separate session identifier in an HTTP header or in the URL.

Applicant's invention, on the other hand, advantageously allows, in one embodiment, a stateless messaging technology like SMS to interact with a stateful, (i.e., session-based system like an interactive voice response (IVR) system). This is accomplished, in one embodiment, by identifying the device that is generating the otherwise stateless messages, (e.g. a phone generating SMS messages) and, optionally, an additional application identifier based on a short code or some other application identifier that can be found in the messages. So, for example, if one user is simultaneously interacting with two different applications using SMS messages from one phone, two different sessions are created and maintained.

Applicants respectfully submit that Low teaches a session based system which stores a state of the session on the user device:

" stores a session identifier for a communication session to be used in the future and passes a copy of the identifier over the network to the first endpoint entity." (Low Abstract)

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Araujo nor Low teach or suggest a "method of controlling an application comprising:

receiving, from a device, a first message via a non-session based, stateless messaging protocol;

providing a session context based on the identity of the user device;

maintaining the session context that maps messages transferred from the device using the non-session based, stateless protocol to a session-based application controlled using a session-based protocol;

... indexing an identity of the device and a preexisting identity of the application in a session table; and

mapping a second message received from the application using the session-based protocol from the session-based application to the non-session based, stateless protocol using the maintained session context to return at least a portion of the second message to the device, further including employing the session context for maintaining the sequence of messages between the device and the application."

Therefore, for at least these reasons, amended claim 1 is patentable over Araujo in view of Low et al. For analogous reasons, the other independent claims, 9, 28, 29, 37, 38 and 40 amend with similar limitations, and the dependent claims by virtue of dependency should also be in condition for allowance.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this

response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an online payment made herewith, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/Barry Gaiman/
Barry Gaiman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 42,562
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive, Suite 280
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: NMS03-20

Dated: November 26, 2008